

Remarks

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action of August 6, 2008.

Summary of the Office Action

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-12 were pending. Claims 1-3 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Multer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,336) (hereinafter “Multer”). Claims 4, 5 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Multer in view of Ims et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0091533) (hereinafter “Ims”). Claims 6, 7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Multer in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th Edition (hereinafter “Microsoft”). Claim 10 stands objected to for alleged minor informalities.

Objection to Claim 10

Claim 10 stands objected to for alleged minor informalities. In response to the objection to claim 10, Applicants have amended claim 10 to incorporate the Examiner’s helpful suggestion as provided at page 2, section 2 of the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claim 10 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Multer. Claims 4, 5 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Multer in view of Ims. Claims 6, 7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Multer in view of Microsoft. With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a), Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied Multer reference discloses a system where several devices, such as personal computers or web browsers, are connected via a network. See Fig. 7 of Multer. Each device comprises synchronization interfaces (see also Fig. 6 of Multer) connected to a storage server located in the aforementioned network.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Multer does not disclose that, among the connected devices shown in Fig. 7, services portals are provided, each service portal hosting at least one personal information manager (PIM) service in the manner specifically described in the combination of features of independent claim 1 of the instant application. Fig. 7 and the corresponding disclosure in the specification of Multer at col. 7, lines 45-67 only teach that the network 700 connects devices such as personal computers, cellular phones, web browsers, etc.. However, Multer does not teach, or even suggest, that web portals with PIM service are connected thereto in the advantageous way disclosed in the instant application and as particularly described in the combination of independent claim 1 of the instant application.

Even further, Applicants respectfully submit that Multer does not disclose that each of said portals is accessible by means of remote access terminals in the manner specifically described in the combination of features of independent claim 1 of the instant application.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that Multer does not disclose that the first synchronization means has a client-server architecture, where the client and server of this architecture respectively comprise a module hosted in one of the portals and, on the other hand, a module hosted within the other portal or within each of the other portals in the manner specifically described in the combination of features of independent claim 1 of the instant application.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submits that Multer, or any of the other cited art, does not disclose at least the above-discussed features of the present invention, as described in the combination of features of independent claim 1 of the instant application. Thus, Applicants believe that the claims in their current form are novel and non-obvious over Multer and the other cited art, whether taken separately or in combination with each other. Applicants also respectfully submit that the art relied upon fails to provide any suggestion for one skilled in the art to adapt the teachings of these documents so as to retrieve the claimed invention.

Independent claims 8 and 10 of the instant application include similar features as discussed above with regard to independent claim 1 of the instant application. Accordingly,

Applicant respectfully submits that similar arguments also apply to independent claims 8 and 10 as discussed above with regard to independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because Multer does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 8 and 10 of the instant application. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Similarly, MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that "[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.' In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)."

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims 2-7, 9 and 11-12 are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, 8 or 10, and the reasons discussed previously.

As to the additionally applied reference to Ims with regard to dependent claims 4, 5 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that this additionally applied reference does not cure the deficiencies discussed previously with regard to Multer. More particularly, Applicants respectfully submit that Ims discloses a system and method for exchanging data using an XML format. See the abstract of Ims. Applicants respectfully submit that Ims does not disclose a system for synchronization between service portals, each hosting at least one personal information manager, such a system including first data synchronization means adapted to establish correspondence between data stored in the portals and having a client-server architecture.

Also, as to the additionally applied reference to Microsoft with regard to dependent claims 6, 7 and 12, Applicants respectfully submit that this additionally applied reference does not cure the deficiencies discussed previously with regard to Multer. More particularly, Applicants respectfully submit that Microsoft discloses the use of Vcard and Vcalendar formats since 1996. However, Microsoft fails to disclose a system for synchronization between service portals, each hosting at least one personal information manager, such a

In re Appln. of Le Lann et al.
Application No. 10/544,289
Response to Office Action of August 3, 2008

system including first data synchronization means adapted to establish correspondence between data stored in the portals and having a client-server architecture.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian c. rupp/

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665
Paul A. Fournier, Reg. No. 41,023
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: November 6, 2008

CH01/ 25245608.1